



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

01
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,358	01/07/2002	Toshiaki Tagawa	P21620	9232

7055 7590 02/08/2005

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER

KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1615

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/926,358

Applicant(s)

TAGAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of applicant's letter dated 11-30-04 that the references used in the double patenting rejections were not cited on form 892, the previous action is vacated. The following is the new action.

The RCE dated 8-19-04 is acknowledged.

Claims included in the prosecution are 10-34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tagawa (5,264,221).

Tagawa discloses liposomal compositions wherein the liposomes have maleimide residues on the surface. A protein (monoclonal antibody) and residues of a compound having polyalkylene glycol moiety are bonded via respective groups to the maleimide residues. The liposomes encapsulate the anti-cancer drug, adriamycin (note the abstract, col. 2, line 45 through col. 5, line 27 and examples). The mol. percent of the bonded compound as disclosed in the reference on col. 4, lines 59-68 appear to fall

Art Unit: 1615

within the claimed range. The degree of polymerization of PEG is 20-400 as noted from col. 4, line 20 which corresponds to instant molecular weights.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant himself admits on page 14, second paragraph of the response, Tagawa teaches 0.1 to 20 mole percent and this amount falls within the range claimed in claim 10. According to applicant, the amounts now expressed in mg, correspond to the original mole percentages. Furthermore, as pointed out in the previous action, according to applicant's own statement on page 15 of the previous response, only half of the maleimidated lipid is assumed to be present outside the liposome and therefore, the percentages taught by Tagawa on col. 4, correspond to both antibody and the compound loaded with PEG compound.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa cited above.

As pointed out above, Tagawa discloses liposomal compositions wherein the liposomes have maleimide residues on the surface.

Art Unit: 1615

A protein (monoclonal antibody) and residues of a compound having polyalkylene glycol moiety are bonded via respective groups to the maleimide residues. The liposomes encapsulate the anti-cancer drug, adriamycin (note the abstract, col. 2, line 45 through col. 5, line 27 and examples). Tagawa's does not teach the entire claimed range of the bonded compound and the bonded antibody. However, on col. 4, line 53 et seq., Tagawa teaches the activation of the liposome first, that is introducing excess amount of maleimide groups and then reacting first with the thiol activated antibody and then blocking the remaining maleimide groups on the liposomes with excess amount of thiol modified PEG. Furthermore, in Example 2 on col. 7, Tagawa uses 5 mg of Fb' per hundred mg of lipid and this amount is instantly claimed 5 mg per 100 mg lipid. From these teachings, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to manipulate the amounts of the thiol activated antibody, since this amount depends upon the amount of the corresponding receptors on/in the host cell and then block the rest of the maleimide groups on the liposomes with the thiol modified PEG. Instant invention therefore, is deemed to be an obvious extension of prior art's teachings.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not found to be persuasive. Applicant directs the examiner's attention to page 2 of the specification and argue that in this section Tagawa is contrasted with reference being made to the 5 mg addition of antibodies as noted above in Example 2 of Tagawa. It is unclear to the examiner as to how this can overcome the rejection. First of all, on page 2, second paragraph of the specification, applicant himself admits that Tagawa teaches 0.1 to 20 mole percent of the thiolated antibodies which equates to 0.3 to 60 mg per 100 mg of

Art Unit: 1615

the total lipid. This amount falls within the range claimed by applicant in instant invention. Secondly as pointed out above, in Example 2, Tagawa uses 5 mg Fb' per 100 mg of lipid and this is very close to instant 4.5 mg. It should also be pointed out that any amount which is expressed in mg quantities depends upon the molecular weight of an antibody and therefore, varies according to the nature of the antibody and whether it is an Ig fraction (or whether it is an IgG or IgA) or a monoclonal antibody or fragment thereof and therefore, the amounts recited in instant claims are variable and this parameter is an obvious parameter manipulated by an artisan to obtain the best possible results. In essence, instant invention is an obvious extension over the prior art teachings.

3. Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirpotin et al (Biochemistry, 1997) of record by itself or in combination with Tagawa cited above.

Kirpotin et al disclose sterically stabilized liposome compositions wherein the antibody is conjugated to maleimide terminated membrane anchor lipid. The polymer used is PEG. Kirpotin however, does not indicate the amounts of the antibody conjugated to the lipid in terms of mg per 100 mg lipid, but instead in mg/ml antibody to 7-10 mM liposomes (note the abstract and Material and methods and Discussion sections). Assuming that the amounts are different, in the absence of showing unexpected results, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to manipulate the amounts of targeting antibody to obtain the best possible results, that is, reaching the target cancer cells expressing the corresponding antigen on the cell surface. One of

Art Unit: 1615

ordinary skill in the art would be motivated further to vary the amounts since the reference of Tagawa as discussed above, shows that one can bind various amounts of antibody to the bilayer forming lipid. Kirpotin does not teach antibodies other than anti-HER2; however, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any antibody since the principle of targeting to the cancer cells is the same. Kirpotin does not teach the treatment of stomach or colon cancer. However, since the liposomes are only delivery devices, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose a specific cancer drug, which is effective against a selected cancer using the liposomes taught by Kirpotin.

4. Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tagawa (5,556,948) or Tagawa (5,686,101).

Tagawa in 948 and 101 discloses liposomal compositions wherein the liposomes have maleimide residues on the surface. A protein (growth factors, monoclonal antibodies and polyclonal) and residues of a compound having polyalkylene glycol moiety are bonded via respective groups to the maleimide residues. The liposomes encapsulate the anti-cancer drug, adriamycin and or other drugs (note the abstract, col. 2, line 45 through col. 6, line 12 and examples in both patents). Since the examples indicate the amounts of the components in terms of mg, it is unclear whether they correspond to the claimed molar amounts. Assuming that they are different, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the amounts to obtain the best possible results.

Art Unit: 1615

4. Claims 10-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosakawa (6,787,153) or Hosakawa (6,139,869).

Tagawa in 948 and 101 discloses liposomal compositions wherein the liposomes have maleimide residues on the surface. A protein (monoclonal antibody, GAHand residues of a compound having polyalkylene glycol moiety are bonded via respective groups to the maleimide residues. The liposomes encapsulate the anti-cancer drug, adriamycin and or other drugs (note the abstract, col. 4, line 47, col. 5, line 39, Examples, examples 7 and 8 specifically and claims in both patents). Since the examples indicate the amounts of the components in terms of mg, it is unclear whether they correspond to the claimed molar amounts. Assuming that they are different, it is deemed obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to vary the amounts to obtain the best possible results.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1615

5. Claims 10-12, 14-23 and 25-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,556,948. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in both patented case and instant application are drawn to liposome compositions wherein both the antibody attached to the liposome surface through maleimidated terminals of the lipid moiety. Instant claims are generic with respect to the phospholipid and a genus anticipates the species of the phospholipid claimed in the patented claims. The language in patented claims does not exclude PEG also linked to the liposome surface claimed in instant claims 16-23 and 25. The patented claims are generic with respect to the amounts of the antibody per 100 mg of lipid claimed in instant claims. Amounts are deemed to be obvious manipulatable parameters practiced by an artisan.

6. Claims 10-12, 14-23 and 25-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,686,101. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in both patented case and instant application are drawn to liposome compositions wherein both the antibody attached to the liposome surface through maleimidated terminals of the lipid moiety. Instant claims are generic with respect to the phospholipid and a genus anticipates the species of the phospholipid claimed in the patented claims. The language in patented claims does not exclude PEG also linked to the liposome surface claimed in instant claims 16-23 and 25. The patented claims are generic with respect to the amounts of

Art Unit: 1615

the antibody per 100 mg of lipid claimed in instant claims. Amounts are deemed to be obvious manipulatable parameters practiced by an artisan.


7. Claims 10-12, 14-23 and 25-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,787,153. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in both patented case and instant application are drawn to liposome compositions wherein both an antibody and PEG are attached to the liposome surface through maleimidated terminals of the lipid moiety. Instant claims are generic with respect to the antibody and a genus anticipates the species of antibody claimed in the patented claims. The patented claims are generic with respect to the amounts of the antibody per 100 mg of lipid claimed in instant claims. Amounts are deemed to be obvious manipulatable parameters practiced by an artisan.

8. Claims 10-12, 14-23 and 25-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,139,869. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in both patented case and instant application are drawn to liposome compositions wherein both an antibody and PEG are attached to the liposome surface through maleimidated terminals of the lipid moiety. Instant claims are generic with respect to the antibody and a genus anticipates the species of antibody claimed in the patented claims. The patented claims are generic with respect to the amounts of the antibody per 100 mg of lipid claimed in instant claims. Amounts are deemed to be obvious manipulatable parameters practiced by an artisan.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D whose telephone number is (571) 272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615

GSK